REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-4, 10, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,914 to Redfern (hereinafter "Redfern"). Claims 2, 5-6, 11-13, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redfern in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,714 to Weyer et al. (hereinafter "Weyer"). Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redfern in view of Weyer and U.S. Patent No. 6,256,663 to Davis (hereinafter "Davis"). Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redfern in view of Weyer and U.S. Patent No. 6,490,575 to Berstis (hereinafter "Berstis"). Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redfern in view of Weyer, Berstis, and Davis.

The present invention is a system and method for delivering a URL link for both solicited and unsolicited information through an email. A system accepts a search request from a user, and generates search results from a first database which is relevant to the search request. The system then conducts another search using the search results from the first database to generate additional (or "second) another search results which may not be exactly relevant to the search request, but are related to the results of the first search. A new webpage is generated to display the two search results, and the address of the new webpage is transmitted to the user through an email.

Redfern discloses a method for a natural language search. In Redfern, a search system accepts a natural language input for a requested search from a user, and extracts relevant terms from the natural language. The search system provides these terms to a plurality of search engines. The search engines conduct searches on the provided search terms and generate 'hits'. The search results from the search engines are accumulated, and redundant data is eliminated. The search results are sorted by the order of rank of each search result.

Weyer discloses a method for online communication. In Weyer, a system establishes a database of contact information of members of a group. The system provides an online interface allowing a user to access the member's internet presence, and provides a communication link between the member and the user. A user first accesses the interface provided by the system, and enters identification information, (i.e. the user's identification and an identification of a person with whom the user wants to contact). The system conducts a search and generates a list of potential members matching the user's request. The user selects a member, and the system displays the member's webpage to the user. The webpage may be an existing webpage or a webpage created by the system for the member. The system notifies the member about the visit via an email, and the email may contain the address of the created webpage and how to modify the contents of the webpage.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Redfern discloses a first memory, a second memory, a first search unit, and a second search unit. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Redfern does not disclose two separate memories for storing two separate databases. Claim 1 recites two separate memories for storing two separate databases. The two databases are different from each other. The Examiner refers to the same element in Redfern, (element 512 in Figure 5), as a disclosure of the two separate memories of claim 1. However, element 512 in Figure 5 of Redfern is not two separate databases, but rather only a single database related to search engine parameters. Redfern discloses the following:

> Next, at step 512, a database of search engine capabilities, requirements and addresses (URL's or other appropriate address information) is consulted to determine the appropriate parameters for each search engine in the selected set of search engines.

(See Redfern column 9 lines 34-38). In Redfern, a natural language input is divided into several search terms, and a set of search engines is selected for the search terms. The system then selects proper parameters for each search engine by consulting with the database 512. Therefore, unlike the Examiner's assertion, element 512 in Redfern is merely a single database for search engine parameters, rather than two separate databases containing two separate set of information.

Moreover, in claim 1 of the present invention, the system conducts two separate searches, one from the first database, and the other from the second database. The first search is conducted from the first database using a keyword or

any other search term input by the user, and the second search is conducted from the second database using the results of the first search. The two searches are different in terms of both search terms and target databases. In Redfern, only a single search is conducted using a plurality of search engines, and the search results are output in a ranked order. Therefore, Redfern is clearly distinguishable from claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that Weyer teaches a webpage unit for displaying first and second outputs on a webpage, and an output unit for generating an email notifying the address of the webpage. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

A new webpage in Weyer is created by the system when the member does not have his or her own webpage. The new webpage is created using publicly available information of the member in advance, without regard to the search request from a user. The pre-created webpage is displayed when a user requests a communication through a webpage. The content of a webpage in Weyer is pre-determined without regard to the search result, and the pre-selected content is merely displayed in response to the user's request.

In contrast, with the present invention of the webpage unit as set forth in claim 1, the webpage unit generates a new webpage using the information provided by two search units in response to a search request from a user. The content of the new webpage is not fixed until a search is completed in response to a particular

search request from a user. Therefore, claim 1 is clearly distinguishable from Weyer, and claim 1 not obvious over Redfern in view of Weyer.

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that claims 3 and 4 are allowable for the same reason presented above.

With respect to claim 10, the system comprises two separate memories for storing two separate databases, a user connection, a first search unit, a webpage unit, and an output unit. The user connection allows a user to search from the first database, and the first search unit conducts a second search from the second database using the results of the first search. The webpage unit generates a new webpage using the search results from the two databases. As stated above with respect to claim 1, Redfern fails to disclose two separate memories for storing two separate databases, and two separate search units for conducting two separate searches using different criteria. Furthermore, Weyer fails to teach a webpage unit generating a new webpage displaying information collected from the two separate databases in response to the user's search request. Therefore, claim 10 is not obvious over Redfern in view of Weyer.

With respect to claim 14, the system comprises a memory for storing two separate databases, a search unit, a webpage unit, and an output unit. The memory contains two separate databases, and the search unit conducts two separate searches in turn, first using the search keyword from the first database, and second using the results of the first search result and the second database. As indicated

above, Redfern fails to disclose a memory containing two separate databases. Element 512 contains only one database, rather than two separate databases. Redfern also fails to disclose a search unit conducting two separate searches in turn using two different search criteria. The system in Redfern conducts only one search using a plurality of search engines, and the search results are output in a ranked order. In addition, Weyer fails to teach a webpage unit generating a new webpage displaying information collected from two separate databases in response to the user's request. Therefore, claim 14 is not obvious over Redfern in view of Weyer.

With respect to claim 2, the Examiner asserts that Redfern and Weyer teach all elements of claim 2 except a security system, but Davis teaches the security system for permitting limited access to the system. However, as stated above, Redfern and Weyer fails to teach all of each elements of claim 1. Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, and therefore it is believed that claim 2 is allowable over Redfern in view of Weyer and Davis.

With respect to claims 5 and 12, the Examiner cited only Redfern and Weyer in rejection of claims 5 and 12. Claims 5 and 12 are method claims corresponding to the systems claimed in claims 1 and 10, respectively. Therefore, claims 5 and 12 are not obvious over Redfern in view of Weyer for the same reason stated above with respect to claims 1 and 10.

With respect to claim 6, the Examiner asserts that a URL and an access code have been disclosed in Davis. However, claim 6 is dependent on claim 5, and

therefore, it is believed that claim 6 is allowable for the same reason presented above with respect to claim 5.

With respect to claims 11 and 15, the Examiner rejected these claims on the same basis as for claim 2. As stated above with respect to claim 2, claim 2 is not obvious over Redfern in view of Weyer and Davis. Therefore, claims 11 and 15 are believed to be allowable for the same reasons presented above.

With respect to claim 13, the Examiner rejected claim 13 for the same reason for claim 6. However, claim 6 is allowable as stated above. Therefore, claim 13 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons presented above.

With respect to claim 7, the Examiner asserts that Berstis teaches a scheme of locating a second database remotely, and all other elements are taught by Redfern in view of Weyer and Davis. Claim 7 is ultimately dependent on claim 5. Since Redfern and Weyer fail to teach all the elements of claim 5, claim 5 is not obvious over Redfern in view of Weyer. Therefore, it is believed that claim 7 is allowable over Redfern in view of Weyer, Davis, and Berstis for the same reasons presented above.

With respect to claim 8, the system comprises two separate memories, a link, a search unit, a webpage unit, and an output unit. One of two memories is located remotely, and the link unit is configured to conduct search from the first database in response to the user's request. As described above, Redfern fails to disclose two separate memories for storing two separate databases, and two separate search

units for conducting two separate searches using different criteria, one for conducting a search from the remotely located first database, and the other for conducting an another search from the second database based on the first search result. In addition, Weyer fails to teach a webpage unit for creating a webpage containing the two search results in response to the user's request. Therefore, claim 8 is not obvious over Redfern in view of Weyer and Berstis.

With respect to claim 9, claim 9 is dependent on claim 8. Therefore, it is believed that claim 9 is allowable over Redfern in view of Weyer, Berstis, and Davis for the same reasons presented above.

For the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention is patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Zylka et al.

By_____
Gerald B. Halt, Jr.
Registration No. 37,633
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

GBH/kag